HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XIV, No. 48 Saturday, November 30, 1957 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

IKE'S STROKE: *The power struggle*.....(page 1)

POWER BALANCE: *Military size up*.....(page 2)

SCIENTISTS: *Behind Teller's testimony*.....(page 2)
Oppenheimer to return?.....(page 3)

EDUCATION: *"Progressivism" scored*.....(page 4)

The Conflict Within: The question today: can the healthy arteries of constitutional Government prevail over a political occlusion? For, veiled by a screen of top-level propaganda and many human and very natural — but irrelevant — considerations in the public mind, only a few allusions in the press suggest the presence of a developing conflict which may decisively shape the course of affairs following the President's "slight stroke."

The conflict emerges as one between (a) Congress (that is, its leaders) on the one hand, grave with concern arising from the knowledge of our national danger; and (b) a Palace Guard tenacious in its hold on power in the Executive branch.

This situation has inspired all the more serious reflection because of intelligence which a fortnight ago was in the rumor stage, but which is now regarded as the basic preliminary to what has gone on in the past five days.

When Ike was checked in at Walter Reed Hospital on November 11 for a "routine check-up," his medical picture was not too encouraging. The communiqué issued as he left did not reveal this fact. But some papers reported that he went to Augusta, Georgia, for a rest because his doctors ordered it. They feared the results on his physique of the long ten-to-twelve-hour day that he devoted to essential work after the Sputnik crisis arose.

Congressional leaders reflected solemnly that, in the present world and domestic crisis (in which our very lives are at stake), Ike could scarcely continue his necessarily long duties and avoid total collapse. We were, they brooded, faced with a "part-time" Presidency — and its implications far transcended the partisan term used by the *Democratic Digest*.

The "slight chill" which turned out to be a "slight stroke" crystallized the long-precipitating conflict. The publicity apparatus of the Palace Guard obviously retarded full disclosure of the facts (the while provoking stock market gyrations of a major sort). Then it assumed full control of news, with the Press Secretary displaying the President's signature as evidence that the stroke was slight.

● *Sherman Rides Again.* Congressional ire was directed chiefly at Presidential First Assistant Sherman Adams. It was noted that when Vice President Nixon was allowed to see the recovering President, Adams was present — climactic evidence of Palace Guard screening. No man is so detested on Capitol Hill as Adams, and nothing was so natural as the remark heard then: "Sherman rides again." For it was recalled that the White House first characterized Ike's serious ileitis attack in June, 1956, as the result of his faulty digestion of blueberry pie at a banquet.

Behind closed doors, congressional leaders of both parties fumed and asserted that they would not meet with Sherman Adams in place of the President at the acutely necessary conferences slated for next week, to lay the course for high policy. And then, more quietly, they discussed the unfortunate situation for which the Constitution offers no detailed course — the problem of a "part-time" President.

Arthur Krock, veteran *New York Times* correspondent, best expressed their somber conclusion when he wrote (November 27): "There is no real substitute in the American governing system for constant hour-by-hour Presidential leadership."

● *The Third Man.* Between Congress — symbolized by Senator Lyndon Johnson (D.-Tex.), Majority Leader of the Senate — and Sherman Adams, who runs the White House, looms The Third Man: Vice President Nixon. Congressional leaders — no matter what their reservations may be about Nixon and his recent utterances on Little Rock and foreign aid — believe dispassionately that the only course consistent with constitutional Government is to have Nixon leadership replace that of the Palace Guard.

Yet, if Nixon assumes leadership, as acting President, without permanent retirement by Ike, they foresee great difficulties. Will he, it is asked, reverse the Eisenhower "complacency" attitude towards the Communist peril, the Little Rock "bayonets" policy, the support for huge foreign aid — so ardently opposed by most members of Congress? And, if he does not, will he then incur the bitter opposition to such courses which has reduced Ike's own leadership to low esteem in the country?

The Third Man is on the spot.

The dilemma is the more disturbing because members of Congress wonder whether the "new Nixon," deferring

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the Modern Republican Palace Guard, will continue; or whether the "old Nixon" will return. Senators recall an alleged cloakroom remark of Nixon's at the time of Ike's first serious illness in 1955.

The Vice President was reported to have said that, if he took over the White House (in case of Ike's death), he would oust Adams and the Guard; not only that, but that he would also "change the locks on the doors so they could never get back."

With such memories, jokes mingle — symptomatic of the thunderhead of resentment that has gathered against the reign of Presidential Assistant Adams. One atrocious pun involving "Adams in the atomic age" is making the rounds: "Atoms for Peace; Atoms for War; Adams for New Hampshire." That's where the denizens under the Dome would like to send him.

But levity is restrained by a sobering conclusion, which may usher in an epochal debate when the full Congress assembles in January. It is: "There is no substitute for constant hour-by-hour Presidential leadership."

The Anchor: In the quicksands of the Capital, the military alone remain serene — at least provisionally. They have certainties to which they are anchored — resistant to political tides set in motion by popular fears and rumors. These certainties, as authoritatively imparted to HUMAN EVENTS, are as follows:

(1) "If they had the capability now, they [the Russians] would have wiped us out by this time," remarked one big striper. Apart from intelligence reports, this situation is obvious: note how Russian launching sites are sending forth only Soviet blackmail — Khrushchev's military boasting and his diplomatic wheedling, as he tells American correspondents of his desire for a Summit conference.

Hence, we have time to catch up and outstrip the Russians in missiles, if we have a "crash program." The current testimony of scientists before the Preparedness Subcommittee (see story below) draws only impatient scorn from our informants.

(2) Time — how much? Maybe 18 months. We have the capability — industrial, financial and scientific — to do it.

(3) What's the enemy's capability now? They probably have one ICBM, or are close to it. But if they used it (which of course they won't, until they have a big stockpile), we would destroy them completely with a blitz launched from our 300 bases (see HUMAN EVENTS for November 16, 1957).

These "stripers" present this fairly hopeful picture in contrast to what they consider some suspiciously pessimistic comments and news stories creeping into the press. The latter offer a virtually despairing picture of America's military plight. Intelligence evaluates this development as inspired by appeasement forces in the Nation, determined to panic the American people into submitting to a Summit conference with Khrushchev.

Preparedness Double Talk: "Proceed full speed ahead with very little hurry"; "gallop slowly"; "rush cautiously" — such are the caustic descriptions of the message embodied in the testimony so far brought out at the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee hearings.

Those who had hoped for invigorating demands for a crash program on missiles experienced keen disappointment. The spirit emanating from the long utterances of scientists Teller and Bush was that of the period 1945-51 when — as they now admit — the US really got behind in the decisive race. It is the spirit of the incredible group who then dominated (and apparently still do now) the main body of American scientists. Then it was their extreme reluctance to work on weapons of mass destruction which would have put us far ahead of Soviet Russia; now it is the same reluctance to embark on an emergency program to insure our national survival.

● *The Riddle of Teller.* The celebrated man who made the hydrogen bomb provided a cleverly worded, equivocal summation of the world power situation — interspersed with many qualifications capable of protecting him at future hearings. Yet he was the man who, almost alone among scientists, courageously pushed the idea of the H-bomb in the late 'Forties. The decision to make it saved the US in the race with Russia. Oppenheimer, who opposed the H-bomb idea, emerged from the affair discredited (see "Through the Looking Glass" item, below). Later, in the Gray Board hearings, Teller gave testimony on Oppenheimer.

Teller's experience after his anti-Oppenheimer testimony, according to insiders, explains his exaggerated discretion at this week's hearings. It is not well known that the famous physicist was virtually ostracized by many of the dominant group of scientists for his testimony in the Oppenheimer hearings. On some occasions he was slighted, on others he was deliberately affronted by such people. Today the father of the H-bomb avoids statements critical of his colleagues (with whom he privately disagrees).

● *Bunkum on Weapons.* Teller, as a result of his testimony, gave the impression that our lag in missiles arose from the fact that, in 1946-47, we did not possess a warhead. But observers were quick to point out that, while we did not have the H-bomb then, we did possess the A-bomb which had destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 — certainly a promise that the necessary range of destruction was as capable of attainment as other ICBM prerequisites. The truth is — according to old hands in the atomic game — that our lag at that time was largely caused by politically misguided scientists who shrank from making either the H-bomb or missiles.

● *Weapons and Funds.* Teller suggested that the Los Alamos plant is badly handicapped by the lack of equipment which would cost $50 million to $55 million. If that be so, the money could easily be obtained from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Atomic Energy Commission, which enjoys a $2 billion budget. In its current budget, at least $250 million is allotted to the uneconomic civilian reactors project — a "prodigious waste of money," according to experts. The AEC could transfer such funds as are needed to the Los Alamos missiles project, or another; or could obtain quick approval for such a transfer from the Appropriations Committees of Congress. Like many other excuses of "lack of money," this apologia does not hold water.

● *What's the Answer?* Leadership and authority — to tell the scientists and technicians to go ahead at full speed in a crash program. That decision, at present, rests in the frail hands of the ailing President.

Inside the State Department: An all-out propaganda attack on the Secretary of State — "Dulles Must Go" — is being prepared, under the direction of Harold Stassen. The usual channels in press and radio will be employed. The "boy wonder" from Minnesota, who was badly routed in a similar offensive against Vice President Nixon in 1956, will make — say insiders — his "last cavalry charge" against the man whom he considers his worst enemy in the Executive branch. The point of the attack will be that Dulles fails to "get along with" (that is, appease) Soviet Russia.

● Under Secretary Christian Herter will not side with Stassen. Herter originally nourished an ambition to succeed Dulles. But today — intimates say — he does not care to become Secretary of State. Enjoying somewhat precarious health, Herter has found — it is said — the duties of Under Secretary very exhausting; he shrinks from the idea of taking on the much heavier responsibility of Secretary of State.

● German Foreign Minister Brentano's hasty trip to Washington to confer with Dulles was made to suggest that West Germany be made an equal partner in NATO, at that organization's forthcoming conference in Paris. This would mean lifting the restrictions on West German rearmament. Observers believe that German contributions — if NATO gave the green light — would tend to tip the balance of military power in favor of the West.

Folsom and Mitchell: Two Modern Republican members of the Eisenhower Cabinet, more than any others, have demonstrated their friendship for the left-wing and have drawn the fire of conservative Republicans in Congress. These are Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Marion B. Folsom, both of whom have enjoyed "he-must-go" boomlets in recent weeks (see HUMAN EVENTS for November 16 and 23, 1957).

Folsom, in particular, has become a symbol of frivolous spending in Government. Commenting on the missile program last week, Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) remarked: "We need an accelerated missiles program and more scientists, but we also need a lot fewer of those welfare projects that Secretary Marion B. Folsom thinks up every three minutes."

Now both Mitchell and Folsom have garnered well-earned recognition for their left-wing proclivities; the *AFL-CIO News* announces that the "squanderbust twins" will be the featured speakers at its second constitutional convention, opening in Atlantic City, December 5.

Conservative comment: "For services rendered."

Two important articles on effective political action — perhaps the two most important studies of current politics to appear in the past decade — are being published by HUMAN EVENTS. The author is Raymond Moley, veteran authority in the field of political science and *Newsweek* columnist. The first appears in this week's issue; the second will follow next week. If you wish to help pave the way to conservative victory, buy reprints and mail them to your friends.

Through the Looking Glass: "Liberals" in press and Government are now building a head of steam behind one of their long-time favorite projects: securing the return to power of scientist J. Robert Oppenheimer, ousted from the atomic energy project as a security risk in 1954. Suggestions that Oppenheimer be restored to high eminence have now begun to fly thick and fast in the Capital, with such voices as those of former Assistant Air Force Secretary Trevor Gardner and Senator Clinton Anderson (D.-N.M.) making the loudest contributions.

Synchronized with the pro-Oppenheimer agitation is the laying of plans to launch a "smear" investigation of Atomic Energy Chairman Lewis Strauss, who — billed as the Administration's "number one advocate of secrecy" — has become the chief villain in today's "liberal" demonology. Getting Oppenheimer in and Strauss out is supposed to reassure frightened, secrecy-hating scientists who shun Government service because of security precautions.

Observers speculate that these devious "liberal" maneuverings must be designed to cover up feelings of guilt. For students of "security" point out these facts:

(1) A *Survey of Attitudes of Scientists and Engineers*, compiled by the President's Committee on Engineers and Scientists for Federal Government programs, discloses (page 62) the responses of over 20,000 scientists and engineers to the question: "Do security regulations prevent you from doing your work satisfactorily?" The answers: scientists in Government employ — 94 per cent "no"; scientists in industry — 95 per cent "no."

● *It is ironically recalled that Oppenheimer himself, in a recent interview in* Newsweek, *dismissed security regulations as an insignificant factor affecting scientific work.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(2) Dr. Wernher von Braun, America's foremost expert on rocket power, has stated (to *Life* magazine) that "the ideal thing is to have *100 per cent secrecy* and all the money we need." How, it is asked, does this expert pronouncement jibe with claims that "secrecy" retards progress?

● *Von Braun also states that America's missile program was delayed because nothing whatever was done in the years 1945-51. These were precisely the years, it is observed, in which Lilienthal, Oppenheimer, et al. — the enemies of "secrecy" in atomic development — were in complete control.*

(3) It is pointed out, finally, that Oppenheimer struggled long and hard to prevent the United States from developing an H-bomb. Since hydrogen warheads are essential for an effective ICBM, Oppenheimer's counsel, if adopted, would have left the United States with no hope whatever of developing a practical intercontinental missile.

Progressive Education: Influential voices in the high echelons of American science last week had harsh words for the effects of "progressive education" on the Nation's rising generation of students. The National Science Foundation, clearinghouse for Government-aided science projects, declared that the key to educational advancement in America lay, not in Federal aid, but in increased emphasis on the fundamentals of education. Primarily needed, Foundation officials say, are more difficult courses and more competently trained teachers. Present requirements for teaching certificates, add the officials, place too much emphasis on educational techniques, too little on mastery of subject matter.

● A similar pronouncement came from Admiral H. G. Rickover, chief of the Naval Reactors Branch of the Atomic Energy Commission. Rickover told a Detroit conference on scientific education that America's chief educational need is to set more rigorous standards of performance for high school students. Suggesting the establishment of a private council to set national standards of excellence to be met by recipients of high school diplomas, Rickover stated:

> **"If the local school continued to teach such pleasant subjects as 'life adjustment' and 'how to know when you are really in love,' instead of trigonometry, French and physics, its diploma, for all the world to see, would be inferior."**

Integration: Evidence continues to mount that the President's invasion of Little Rock, generally viewed as demolishing the GOP in the South, is running into stiff opposition from Northern conservatives as well. Washington political analysts, balancing the results of the integration furor, have already taken due note of recent elections in New York City, New Jersey and Cincinnati, Ohio (see HUMAN EVENTS for November 9 and November 23, 1957). Seen as a further indication that Northern voters and their representatives are not in sympathy with the paratroop integration tactics of the Administration are the recent remarks of Representative August E. Johansen (R.-Mich.). A conservative who voted against this year's civil rights bill in the House, Johansen has announced his intention of opposing further "tough" civil rights moves in the next session of Congress. "I think the time has come," he said, "for a moratorium on toughness."

Johansen added that reaction to his civil rights stand in his Michigan District (which includes Battle Creek) has been favorable. "By and large," he told the AP, "the reception I have had is good."

● An index to hardening Southern resistance to integration is seen in this week's action by a special session of the Texas state legislature. Texas lawmakers, convened by Governor Price Daniel for the express purpose of voting emergency anti-integration measures, drafted a bill requiring that any school where violence and military force appear to threaten shall be closed — on the application of the local school board.

The point of reference for this bill, it is observed, is clearly the Little Rock invasion. Texas schools, scheduled for stepped-up integration pressures next semester, will now apparently be closed before Federal troops can take them over.

Indexed Bound Volumes for 1957 may now be ordered for March delivery. Regular price, $15; prepublication price, accepted until December 31, 1957, $7.50 each. Bound indexed volumes for 1955 and 1956 available at $15. None available for previous years.

Vice Admiral John F. Shafroth, U.S.N. (Retd.): "A frank, fearless and honest presentation of the news is of great value in helping to preserve the strength and welfare of our country. I have for several years been a subscriber of HUMAN EVENTS and find it of great interest and of great value."

Additional copies of this 4-page News Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In 5000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 48 HUMAN EVENTS November 30, 1957

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

THE BIG ROADBLOCK TO CONSERVATIVE VICTORY

By RAYMOND MOLEY
Contributing Editor, *Newsweek*

Raymond Moley is known to millions of Americans today for his authoritative weekly column, "Perspective," appearing in *Newsweek* magazine. In this article, the first of two installments, he discloses and analyzes the amazing revolution that has taken place in American politics – particularly in the last ten years. Renowned as the head of President Roosevelt's "Brain Trust" in the opening days of the New Deal, Moley broke with FDR when he saw that his leftward path could not be reversed. An analyst who understands the hard realities of American politics at the level of the precinct and the Congressional District – as well as in its deepest theoretical aspects – Moley is uniquely qualified to sift the great mass of political fact produced by elections of the last decade, and to point out its meaning for conservative Americans.

NO OTHER political event in our time so surprised the American people as the election of 1948, when the Republican party snatched defeat from the very jaws of victory. I shared in that surprise. A year of sober reflection followed.

The facts which emerged from the fog of conjecture after Dewey's defeat made it clear that the miracle was not Truman's, although no one denied him credit for a game fight. Nor was it merely the handiwork of unhappy farmers. Something had come into the political scene which was novel, powerful and in many cases decisive: *something in Congressional Districts and states.*

The facts proved the paradox that it was the weakness rather than the strength of the Democratic party that made its victory possible. The party itself had been captured by an ally – organized labor. *Never again were traditional Democrats to be masters in their own household.*

In midsummer 1948, it was believed by the political leaders of the CIO-PAC that Truman was likely to lose. Also, that victory for him was incidental to their major interests. They therefore decided to concentrate their efforts on electing as many members of the House and Senate as they could. They bided their time until October, and then they hurled everything they had of money and manpower into selected Congressional Districts and states.

The results abundantly justified their strategy. Dewey carried 16 states and received a respectable number of Electoral votes – 189. But his party lost nine Senatorships and 74 seats in the House. For the first time, so far as I have been able to determine, a winning candidate for President ran behind his party's candidates for the House of Representatives. Truman's plurality was 2,135,747. That of Democratic candidates for the House was 2,861,442.

The impact of the political force of the unions would have been far less potent except for the corrosion of the two traditional political parties. As early as 1935, President Roosevelt and his shrewd political adviser and lieutenant, Edward J. Flynn of the Bronx, decided to do something about the decay in their own party. Flynn summarized their strategy in a conversation I had with him at the time:

"There are two or three million more dedicated Republicans than Democrats in the country. The election of 1932 was not normal. The depression defeated Hoover. To remain in power we must attract some millions of voters who are now indifferent or hostile to both parties. They believe the Republican party to be dominated by big business and the Democratic party to be controlled by the conservative South. These millions are mostly in the cities and include racial minorities and labor groups. We must attract them by a leftist program."

The fulfilment of the Roosevelt-Flynn plan appeared in the newly created CIO, and its subsequent rapid growth during World War II. Politically minded CIO leaders like Sidney Hillman and Walter Reuther were not slow in taking advantage of the open door to a sympathetic national Administration. The ultimate domination of the Democratic party became a matter of course; the CIO became the "man who came to dinner."

The Unions' Road to Power

Three major factors contributed to the rising strength of the unions in politics:

- *First,* there was the patronage of a dominant political regime in Washington, with sympathetic laws and kindred spirits in strategic spots such as the NLRB, the various war industry boards, and the Department of Labor;
- *Second,* there was the immense advantage of virtually compulsory union membership in the war industries and dues money pouring into union treasuries;
- *Third,* and most important, there was the union shop. This meant a controlled treasury of great size and thousands of captive political workers – officers of the unions, shop stewards and members of bargaining units – all of them available for the vital job of getting voters registered and to the polls.

During the war there were certain watchful members of Congress who succeeded in inserting in the War Labor Disputes Act a prohibition against levies on the general funds of the unions for political purposes. To bypass this, there was formed the CIO Political Action Committee (PAC), and later the AFL Labor League for Political Education (LLPE).

However, there was no effort to separate the unions from these political agencies. The same people in most cases were officially directing both.

THE AUTHORS of the Taft-Hartley Act decided to end these subterfuges and protect the general funds of the unions from political exploitation. They extended to labor organizations the prohibitions enacted 40 years before to curb corporations. Representatives of the unions, however, told the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in 1956 that they consider that they may carry on as "educational" activities certain specified activities, and support these out of the general funds of the unions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Subcommittee's report lists these activities as follows:

"(1) Systematically organize drives for the registration of voters;

"(2) Carry out a systematic program of political education, including organization of schools where political questions are discussed, and the compilation and distribution of voting records; and

"(3) Exercise the right of free speech by expressing their views on political questions in print and by means of radio and television and otherwise."

This range of activities makes clear that some unions simply take over the essential things that candidates and parties are accustomed to do. *Thus, instead of making direct contributions to candidates or parties, they take over the jobs of candidates and parties.* And they do it much more efficiently and over twelve months of the year.

The Record: 1948-57

The tremendous victory of the Democratic party in the Congressional elections in 1948 was evidence of the growing power of the PAC, by that time well in control of the Democratic party in Michigan. It was also growing evidence of the success attained by the politically acute Walter Reuther in avoiding the intent of the Taft-Hartley prohibition against the political use of union funds.

The rebuff suffered by the unions in Ohio in their efforts to defeat Senator Taft in 1950 merely taught them more clever and discreet turns of strategy. In 1952, the political leaders of the unions were massed in force at the Democratic convention. Alben Barkley, Vice President of the United States seeking the Presidential nomination, appeared humbly before them asking their approval. This drumhead board of political review rejected his plea, and in a most humiliating statement he withdrew from the contest.

In his memoirs, ex-President Truman cynically commented that Barkley should have approached each union boss individually rather than *en banc*. That, he explained, is what he did so successfully in seeking the Vice Presidency in 1944. Apparently Truman could see nothing wrong in this assumption of power by 16 men. His criticism had to do only with method.

In 1954, the unions clearly indicated their power by winning for the Democratic party control of both houses of Congress. Twenty-one House seats were switched from Republican to Democratic. Four Democratic seats and one independent seat were won by Republicans. In that net Democratic gain of 16 there is convincing evidence that the political activity of unions was decisive in ten or twelve. Control of the Senate was switched by the victories of Neuberger in Oregon and McNamara in Michigan, both decisively backed by union forces.

There were also striking victories in that year and in 1956 in elections for state offices.

Now, in 1957, Republicans have lost 13 Governorships while gaining only two since 1953. Democrats have seized control of eight lower houses of state legislatures, a net gain. They have won control of eight state senates, also a net gain. Over the Nation there are 308 fewer Republican members of state lower houses and 141 fewer Senators than in 1953.

It is noteworthy that most United States Senators elected in 1952, in the Eisenhower sweep, will be up for re-election in 1958. In seven of the 13 states in which Republicans have lost Governorships, Republican Senate seats are at stake in 1958. That prospect, coupled with the growing power and skill of the political arms of the unions, offers a grim prospect for the Republican party.

It was perfectly clear in 1956 that the high command in the Democratic National Committee practically turned over the Congressional campaign to the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education. This mission was well accomplished.

With the merger of the AFL and CIO in 1955 the CIO-PAC and the AFL's Labor League for Political Education were coalesced in the AFL-CIO *Committee on Political Education*—known as COPE. George Meany, head of the AFL, made this significant announcement after the merger:

"The scene of battle is no longer the company plant or the picket line. It has moved into the legislative halls of Congress and the state legislatures."

He might more accurately have said that the scene of battle had moved back to the local Districts where legislators are chosen — *in short, that the AFL-CIO is content to let the making of laws take its natural course, so long as the AFL-CIO COPE makes the lawmakers.*

"More and more," commented James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, "the answers to labor's problems are political." And the grim note of discipline was contributed by COPE's director, James L. McDevitt: "We are going to get the labor leaders who differ publicly with the position of candidates and issues already established by the labor movement. . . . We are warning you now, and we are warning all in the future: do not differ with the movement with respect to issues or candidates. We will not stand for it." The "movement" is the small group which dominates the AFL-CIO COPE.

The Secrets of Union Strategy

A manual of directions was issued by COPE in 1956. It is, in my judgment, the most attractive, wise and effective textbook on practical politics that has appeared in my time — 250 pages of easy, catchy, colorful prose, illustrated with drawings and photographs.

A second publication of great importance in 1956 was a compilation of the voting records of every Senator and Representative in Congress. The issues selected for the test stretched over the past ten years. There were 20 test votes for Senators and 19 for House members. Fifteen million copies of this record were distributed to the membership of unions.

After the 1956 election, COPE's director admitted that his organization had supported no Republicans for the Senate and only 20 Republican members of the House.

In the very biased report of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, which dealt with the campaign of 1956, there is an exceedingly inadequate report of the money used by the unions in that campaign. But by piecing together three categories of expenditures, it appears that unions spent $2,981,175 raised from "voluntary" sources. Eighty per cent of this came from the United Automobile Workers, the Steelworkers, the Ladies' Garment Workers, and Railway Labor's Political League. This covered only national, not local, expenditures. And, it was money from the "voluntary" contributions of members. It did not include "education" expenditures taken from the general funds of unions.

It was notable in the 1956 campaign that the activity of COPE was extremely mobile, in contrast with the traditional localized, muscle-bound activity of the old party organizations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It moved over state lines into strategic Districts and states. *Moreover, there was specific evidence that the strategy was to strike for Senate and House seats in places where union activity was least expected.* States with relatively small populations – such as Oregon, Idaho and Colorado – were won by union-approved candidates for the United States Senate. Congressional Districts such as the one in eastern Oregon were easy pickings.

MONEY IS only an incidental explanation of the immense massed power of COPE. It had at its command, and under the stricture laid down by McDevitt, thousands of workers – that indispensable factor in winning elections. The UAW had 3000 locals, each with an average of ten staff members. If we add to that shop stewards and others who could be commanded to work, the UAW alone was able to throw tens of thousands of workers into the campaign over the country. The Steelworkers had something like 1200 full-time staff members and 12,000 shop stewards probably available for election work. It was estimated that over the Nation COPE was able to put 100,000 cars into action on election day.

These figures, it should be said, cannot apply to all unions. But it may be assumed that in many other unions, both CIO and AFL, the Committee on Political Education was able to mobilize many thousand political workers.

The efficiency of an operation in which COPE goes in to capture a Congressional seat hitherto held by a Republican is well illustrated by what happened in 1956 in the 11th California District. This District is in the lush valley south of Sacramento and east of Oakland. Its population of 377,000 is about evenly divided between urban and rural, but many of the rural residents are non-farming people. A rich agricultural industry is still predominant, although other types of industry are moving in.

Leroy Johnson, the Republican incumbent, was in many ways a good Congressman but he was also a poor fencemender and a weak campaigner. Even people within his own ranks showed signs of disaffection. All of this made a perfect theater of operations for the union leaders. As a candidate there was selected John J. McFall, a lawyer with war service, experience in minor elective offices and, judging by his biography, a passion for joining clubs and societies. An on-the-scene observer thus describes what happened:

"COPE organizers came into the District well in advance of the 1956 primary, made sure that all union members and their wives and families were properly registered. Then (with check-off lists) they saw to it that these people got out and voted in the primary. These COPE workers continued to work in the period between the primary and election.

"They received propaganda from national headquarters and blanketed the District with it. They took McFall in hand and coached him in the art of making speeches and in writing statements and letters. Following the minute specifications in the COPE 'How to Win' manual, they organized every precinct down to the smallest detail. On election day the cars rolled, the baby-sitters sat, the poll-watchers watched, the telephone-workers telephoned and when the returns were in, the 11th District had been COPEtivated – organized labor had another Congressman on its list of favorites."

Michigan and California

John Feikens, Republican leader in Michigan, alleged before the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in May, 1955, certain facts concerning the activities of the UAW in the political campaign of 1954 in his state. He listed certain hundreds of thousands spent for such items as "editorial," "radio," "research," "educational" and "citizenship." But the only item the UAW would probably admit as political was "Citizenship Fund-PAC Department expense, $384,443.33."

Later in 1955, after prodding by Feikens and others, the US Department of Justice brought an indictment against the UAW for violation of Taft-Hartley for an act included under the "educational" program. Specifically, it was the presentation of a candidate for office on a program sponsored by the UAW. Federal Judge Picard threw out the indictment on the ground that the act in question was not a statutory offense.

In March, 1957, the Supreme Court reinstated the indictment. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in a long opinion, declared that the proscription in the Taft-Hartley Act did in fact cover "the expenditure of union dues to pay for commercial broadcasts that are designed to urge the public to elect a certain candidate or party." The Court, however, left the constitutional issue involved hanging in air. Since three Justices – Warren, Black and Douglas – vigorously asserted that the action alleged enjoyed the protection of the First Amendment and since new Justices have appeared on the Court subsequent to the hearing of the UAW case, it may well be that the legal prohibition involved will be declared unconstitutional. *Inasmuch as that will also release corporations from the restriction, only chaos can result.*

It may be a long, long time before either the Congress or the Court will be able to draw a line between what is "educational" and what is "political." There the legal situation stands, with AFL-CIO COPE girding its loins for an all-out drive in 1958.*

* The case against the UAW on this indictment was tried before a District Court in Detroit, and on November 6, 1957 the UAW was acquitted. The constitutional issue is still open and apparently there is no bar at the moment to much more active participation by corporations in political affairs. It would seem that the matter is now squarely in the lap of Congress.

The progressive steps by which the UAW has made itself the political master of Michigan show a pattern which is beginning to appear in other states. The Michigan Democratic party is a UAW party. The state government is almost completely dominated by that party. California is another Michigan, in transition.

WHEN IN August, 1956, the Republican National Convention assembled in well-ordered splendor in San Francisco, the party position in California seemed firm as a rock. Did not the state have a Republican Governor and two Republican United States Senators? Did not the GOP enjoy a measurable majority in the state legislature, and have 19 of the 30 members of the US House of Representatives? Had not the national Republican ticket swept the state in 1952 with 700,000 to spare? Had it not nominated Senator Knowland in that year on both tickets with the biggest majority ever gathered by a candidate for any office in the United States except a President or Vice President – 1,600,000?

But back of this luminous facade trenchant forces were eating away Republican supremacy. A flabby, inert Democratic party has been awakened and beefed up by a powerful ally.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican candidates for the US House of Representatives in 1948 received 59.4 per cent of the vote, but in 1952 – despite an Eisenhower victory in the state – that margin had dropped to 54 per cent. And in 1956, while Eisenhower was again sweeping the state, the percentage was to drop to 46.8.

The unions desperately want control of the State Legislature, not only to checkmate any legislation such as a right-to-work law, but to be in a position to reconstruct California's Congressional Districts after 1960. At that time reapportionment is expected to give eight new seats to the growing Golden State. After the elections of 1952, there were in the State Assembly 44 Republicans and 36 Democrats. In the Senate there were 28 Republicans and 11 Democrats. But as a result of the 1956 election there are now in the Assembly 42 Republicans and 38 Democrats, and in the Senate 20 Republicans and 20 Democrats.

I have already shown COPE's pattern of action by the illustration of what happened in the 11th California District. It is noteworthy that COPE has been centering on Districts and states in which the *greatest number of state and Federal legislators can be gained by the least effort.* All along the eastern border of California, in counties which are certainly not primarily industrial, the unions make common cause with populistic farmers, public power propagandists and other "liberal" groups.

Meanwhile, there is activity of the same sort in the more heavily populated western and southern sections of the state – but conducted more subtly, grooming potential candidates for the State Legislature and Congress.

The over-all picture of the counties of the state shows a common pattern. In the past four biennial elections solid Republican counties have become marginal, and marginal Republican counties have slipped over to the Democratic side, while marginal Democratic counties have become solid.

What Is Really at Stake

At this point I want to stress, with all emphasis, that I am not attacking unions for their interest in politics. They have every right in law and morals to create a political organization to promote their interests in government. So far as the efficiency of their methods is concerned, I tender them my ardent professional admiration.

My purpose in describing this concentration of political power is to raise three vital questions – questions pertinent to all Americans, in unions as well as outside unions.

- My first question has to do with the character of the political program promoted by the AFL-CIO COPE. *Two-thirds of the issues before Congress on the basis of which COPE appraised members in its publication of voting records dealt with broad national issues. And in these it rated as "approved" measures toward greater intervention by government in economic and social life. Also, the preferred intervention is by Federal rather than state and local authority. In short, the trend of COPE's "approval" is toward Federal statism.*

- My second question concerns the use of the general funds of the unions, which are the property of all dues-paying members, for patently political purposes under the guise of "education."

In the first place, the impact of such large sums as are available for such political action is inimical to the electoral process itself. This is a fact abundantly proved in American political history; it has over and over been recognized by state and Federal legislation limiting and regulating political expenditures. The moral issues in the use of general funds for purposes and candidates preferred by union officers is the wrong of using a person's property in the interest of a cause or candidate to which he is opposed.

- The third peril, again to union members as well as all other Americans, is the trend toward class parties and class Government. While the political program of the AFL-CIO COPE is designed to appeal to groups other than union members, the fact is that the organization itself is composed of members of a single economic group. Thus it is essentially a special-interest or class organization. When it, in fact, becomes the Democratic party – as it has in some states and localities – we shall have a class party. For this to prevail over the Nation would mark a profound change in our political patterns and customs.

WHATEVER may have been the weaknesses of our traditional parties, they did seek to represent all groups. They assumed the existence, and dedicated themselves to the ideal, of a classless society. That was their glory and good. Moreover, the political ideal which I have always regarded as quite specially American is political action upon a broader base than mere economic status and rewards. This ideal America is not that of a rich pasture inhabited only by herds of bovine, munching men and women. Nor a place where birds of a feather stick together to get collectively what they can from other flocks of another feather.

The trend toward class parties is not a subject for legal restrictions or regulations. Wisely, the makers of the American Constitution left the creation of parties to voluntary action. Nor under present leadership is the program of AFL-CIO likely to be broadened from within the unions. It can be neutralized, however, by a general revival of interest in politics across the Nation and in every part of society.

(Next week's article will discuss methods for achieving conservative victory.)

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "THE BIG ROADBLOCK TO CONSERVATIVE VICTORY" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately – at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name .....

Street.....

City .....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED